

SANSKRIT EPIC TRADITION

I. EPIC AND EPITOME (RĀMĀYAṆA AND RĀMOPĀKHYĀNA)

There has been over a century of controversy about the inter-relation of the two epics, ever since the time of Albrecht Weber¹. It is undoubtedly too sanguine to expect that further contributions will settle the question finally, but they may perhaps help to clarify the issues involved. The present article starts from the view that the *Rāmopākhyāna* is based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*, as Sukthankar long ago demonstrated², although there have been dissentient voices since³. Its aim is firstly to corroborate Sukthankar's conclusions by adding further examples in order to show how closely the *Rāmopākhyāna* is based on the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and secondly to define more precisely from which version of the *Rāmāyaṇa* it is derived⁴.

1. ALBRECHT WEBER, *Über das Rāmāyaṇa*, « Sitzungsberichte d. Ak. d. Wissensch. », Berlin, 1870. This is the first of three articles in which I plan to explore the inter-relation of the epics.

2. V. S. SUKTHANKAR, *The Rāma Episode (Rāmopākhyāna) and the Rāmāyaṇa*, in « A Volume of Studies in Indology presented to Prof. P. V. Kane », Poona, 1941, pp. 472-87.

3. Most notably P. L. Vaidya (*Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa, Yuddhakāṇḍa*, critically edited by P. L. V., Baroda, 1971, pp. XXXI-XXXVI) argues that the *Rāmopākhyāna* as an integral part of the *Mahābhārata* « is much older than the poem of Vālmiki ». This view would scarcely warrant mention, had it not prompted or at least stimulated two more recent contributions. V. Raghavan has broadly reaffirmed Sukthankar's view in his *The Greater Ramayana*, Varanasi, 1973, pp. 11-25. J. A. B. van Buitenen has to some extent accepted Vaidya's stance by arguing that the *Rāmopākhyāna* is « a brief, tersely stated compendium that the storyteller would know by heart and on the basis of which he could elaborate and improvise the full narrative » and « So if *Rāma* and *Rām.*, show variations the probabilities are that *Rāma* is closer to its archetype than *Rām.* is to its own. *Rāma* cannot be a summary of *Rām.* as we have it now » (*The Mahābhārata*, vol. 2, translated and edited by J. A. B. van B., Chicago, 1975, pp. 207-214, esp. 210-11).

4. In the same way G. C. Jhala has given further precision to one of Sukthankar's articles in « *The Nala Episode and the Rāmāyaṇa* » A Footnote, « Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute », 48-49, 1968, pp. 295-8, and come to similar conclusions to the present article.

To start with some figures, Jacobi noted twelve parallels between the two, which Sluszkiewicz increased to possibly 57, while Sukthankar, through his work on the *Āraṇyakaparvan* for the Critical Edition of the *Mahābhārata*, was able to produce a list of 86 correspondences; if one adds a few others pointed out for example by Raghavan, then rather over one hundred had previously been identified⁵. The lists appended contain 305 such correspondences, amounting to over 400 *pādas*. Since the *Rāmopākhyāna* is just over 700 śloka long, this means that one *pāda* in seven is paralleled in the *Rāmāyaṇa*⁶. Also, they are distributed very evenly — the smallest number occurs in the shortest *adhyāya* and the largest in the longest one — which demonstrates the uniformity of the *Rāmopākhyāna* in this regard. However, it may be remarked that the ends of the *adhyāyas* of the *Rāmopākhyāna* do not correspond at all closely to the division of the *Rāmāyaṇa* into *kāṇḍas*, which implies that one or both divisions are later than the composition of the *Rāmopākhyāna*.

The list of correspondences occurring in sequence in the *Rāmāyaṇa* (second table, part I) is more than twice as long as the list of those found at random. In reality the disparity is even more pronounced, for listed with those in random order are the parallels to the *Rāmopākhyāna* summary (adhy. 258) and its genealogy of Rāvaṇa (adhy. 259), as well as a considerable number of stereotyped *pādas*, on all of which I shall have further comment to make. As will soon become apparent, the closeness of order in the parallels suggests that the *Rāmopākhyāna* is drawn from something like the existing *Rāmāyaṇa*, although perhaps the greater randomness of the parallels with the *Bāla* and *Uttara kāṇḍas* suggests that the *Rāmopākhyāna* preceded them; in fact the *Rāmopākhyāna* is completely ignorant of the *Uttarakāṇḍa* and quite clearly ends its account at the close of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa*. Indeed the *Rāmopākhyāna*, by devoting greater space to the events of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa*, tends to emphasise the martial aspect of the story at the expense of other elements in Rāma's character stressed in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, his filial obedience, his attachment to Sītā and his concern for *dharma*.

It is abundantly evident from the lists of parallels that the *Rāmopākhyāna* is in general closer to the Northern recension of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. If the *Rāmopākhyāna* were earlier, this would mean that the Northern recension is in fact the more conservative, on such points at least, but to form such a conclusion is to fly in the face of all the evidence of the

5. H. JACOBI, *Das Rāmāyaṇa*, Bonn, 1893, pp. 72-3; E. SLUSZKIEWICZ, *Przyczynki do badan nad dziejami redakcyj Rāmāyany*, Kraków, 1938, pp. 13-32; SUKTHANKAR, *op. cit.*; RAGHAVAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 14 and 20.

6. I have excluded from this calculation *Mbh.* 3.276, which is part of the *Rāmopākhyāna* so far as the *Mahābhārata* is concerned but in fact consists of Mārkaṇḍeya driving home the moral to Yudhiṣṭhira. The precise figures are 409 *pādas* parallel in 704 stanzas, raised to 713 by allowing for 3-line stanzas, with a further 13 *pādas* of * passage parallel.

Rāmāyaṇa itself. The more likely, indeed the only sensible, solution is that the *Rāmopākhyāna* is later. Thus, the Northern recension of the *Rāmāyaṇa* with its innovations was well established before the fixing of the text of the *Mahābhārata*, of which after all the *Rāmopākhyāna* forms a part. For, from the number and the nature of the parallels, it is clear that the *Rāmopākhyāna* is *not* based on the Southern recension of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, even in an earlier form. Two other possibilities remain: that it was based on the N recension in an earlier form, before its divergence into NE and NW, or that it is based on a form of the *Rāmāyaṇa* prior to the emergence of separate recensions. The problem with the first view is that there are a significant number of agreements with the S recension but on balance this is the view that I would favour, for there is the even bigger problem with the other view that the S recension, which in the case of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is usually, and I think rightly, held to be the more conservative, would be shown to have innovated or even worse dropped significant material more or less throughout the text.

It is unfortunate that Sukthankar found Sluszkiewicz's arrangement « rather complicated and confusing »⁷, for it resulted in his missing the majority of the correspondences between the *Rāmopākhyāna* and the Bengal recension and their significance. Sluszkiewicz's list is in three parts: in the first section he lists twelve correspondences between the *Rāmopākhyāna* and the Bombay recension, in the second 25 correspondences between the *Rāmopākhyāna* and the Bengal recension, while in the third he gives 20 passages of the *Rāmopākhyāna* which are as distant from either recension. There is therefore some difference of status between the sections: the first two correspond closely to what Jacobi began previously and Sukthankar extended subsequently, whereas the third section is in reality quite similar to van Buitenen's annotation of his translation of the *Rāmopākhyāna* with the source sections of the *Rāmāyaṇa*⁸. However, to return to the first two parts of Sluszkiewicz's list, it is significant that he found twice as many correspondences with the Bengal recension, and Sluszkiewicz himself drew attention to the fact, while also pointing out that the author of the *Rāmopākhyāna* could not have relied exclusively on that recension. He goes on rather hesitantly to suggest that the author of the *Rāmopākhyāna* may have drawn on a third recension which might in fact be the archetype of our present versions⁹.

7. *Op. cit.*, p. 476, commenting on Sluszkiewicz, loc. cit.

8. J. A. B. VAN BUITENEN, tr., *The Mahābhārata*, vol. 2, pp. 727-60; van Buitenen himself, as noted earlier, would not regard the *Rāmāyaṇa* as the source of the *Rāmopākhyāna*, while accepting none the less that « It is also exceedingly close to *Rām* ». His opinion seems based essentially on the view that variations in the order of narration rule out direct borrowing but seems to me to ignore the requirements of an abbreviated treatment.

9. SLUSZKIEWICZ, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-38.

A sixth of the parallels in the *Rāmopākhyāna* to passages in the *Rāmāyaṇa* are not supported by the bulk of the manuscript evidence; some of these are noted in the lists as variant readings, others as * passages. By chance the number of such passages is just 50 and it is therefore easy to express in percentage terms their affiliations. 42% of these passages are found in all or most N mss., 26% in S mss., 16% in both N and S mss., and 16% in NE mss. alone or, in two cases, with slight support elsewhere. To regroup these figures differently, if we set aside those passages found in both recensions (16%), more than twice as many of the rest are from the N recension in some form as from the S recension (58% against 26%). Even more interesting is the fact that to the 16% found in the NE recension can be added a further 8% where NE agrees with S in the reading (half the number of passages where any N and S mss. agree), especially when we note that there are no such passages attested solely or mainly in the NW or W recensions. Thus it is clear that the primary affiliation of the *Rāmopākhyāna* is with the N recension of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and in particular with NE.

However, the matter cannot be left there. First, we may note the absence of parallels to the NW or W recensions. This may suggest that these recensions are secondary at least in this regard. In the introduction to the *Bālakāṇḍa*, G. H. Bhatt seems to suggest that NW and W tend to go with S against NE; he states this specifically of the W recension a little further on¹⁰. Perhaps more accurately they should be regarded as evolving later and thus as having somewhat less value for constituting the text of the *Rāmāyaṇa* than the Critical Edition assigned them. Incidentally, this would put in a rather different light the question of whether NW and W are separate recensions, an issue on which Bhatt changed his mind¹¹. Alternatively, it could be held that the *Rāmopākhyāna* is definitely drawing from two recensions of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, following normally the NE but also consulting S, but did not know or possess NW or W.

If we are willing to think in terms of the existing recensions or something very like them, then such a view might be feasible; but I would suggest that the problem is more complex. There are a significant number of instances where for one *Rāmopākhyāna* śloka the parallels are found partly in the Northern recension and partly in the Southern. Two examples quite close together are Mbh.3.264.66 and 265.11. In the first of these, the first line has a fairly close resemblance to the Southern insert 5.614* 1-2 but the second line is virtually identical to the Northern insert 5.617* 1; the *Rāmopākhyāna* continues in 67 with the four mini-

10. *Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa, Bālakāṇḍa*, critically edited by G. H. Bhatt, Baroda, 1960, pp. XXX and iv.

11. *Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa, Aranyakāṇḍa*, critically edited by P. C. Divanji, Baroda, 1963, pp. XXIII-XXV (the introduction is by G. H. Bhatt).

sters mentioned at 5.614* 6 (but Ck regards the intervening lines as interpolated) and 5.617* 2. Unless we regard this as an instance of the *Rāmāyaṇa* borrowing from the *Rāmopākhyāna*, which seems implausible here, we must either say that the *Rāmopākhyāna* reproduces something like the original from which the *Rāmāyaṇa* recensions diverged or consider that the *Rāmopākhyāna* welded together the two lines found in the separate recensions recognising the appropriateness of repeating *śveta*. Sluszkiewicz noted this example as an instance where the *Rāmopākhyāna* was closer to the Bengal recension (i.e. N). He also gave the second example as a case where both recensions were equally distant from the *Rāmopākhyāna*. Certainly, neither recension corresponds exactly to the *Rāmopākhyāna*, but 265.11ab is closer to the Southern recension represented by the text of 3.53.14ab, while the third *pāda* is closer to the Northern recension at 3.1056* 4 pr. Again divergence from an original close to the present *Rāmopākhyāna* seems the best explanation.

However, there is one passage in the older books which may possibly provide an instance of reverse borrowing. Mbh.3.261.17cd + 18 is paralleled in Rām.2.133* 1, 8.3ab and 135*; the first is attested by the majority of the N mss. (and M4), the second is read by all mss. except B4 (by omission), but 135* has more scattered support among N mss. and is not found in the oldest of them. It may be therefore that 135* has been copied from the *Rāmopākhyāna*. There is also a remote possibility that such is the case with the other two, since the opening of the *Ayodhyākāṇḍa* shows strong signs of reworking at the end of the second stage of the *Rāmāyaṇa*'s growth, the time also of the *Bāla* and *Uttara kāṇḍas*' composition. More complex is the case of Mbh.3.275.33 which in general is closer to the text of Rām.7.26.44 but shares the unusual root $\sqrt{\text{phal}}$ with 7.548*, the version of the N recension (and T3.4), for here reverse borrowing is likely.

Now let me add some examples which do not appear in the lists of verbal correspondences. Mbh.3.273.28b follows the v.l. of NE mss. at 6.80.51 in naming Avindhya not Supārśva as Rāvaṇa's pacifier, as Raghavan has also pointed out¹². Mbh.3.274.15 has Rāma suspect that Mātali come with Indra's chariot is another of Rāvaṇa's magical deceptions. The basis for this, as both Sluszkiewicz and Raghavan have pointed out¹³, is to be found in the passages 6.2087* and 2088* occurring in the NE recension, but the incident is absent from the S recension and only hinted at in the NW recension in 6.2086*. Elsewhere the *Rāmopākhyāna* follows the order of narration of one recension but the wording of the other, for example 263.39c appears at the same point as 3.1289* 4 / 1290* but is closer in wording to 3.71.25a, which is in fact uttered by a different speaker.

12. RAGHAVAN, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

13. SLUSZKIEWICZ, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-4 and RAGHAVAN, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

One example of a *Rāmopākhyāna* parallel occurring in the NE recension is particularly interesting; this is 2.260* 2 = 261.25ab, for this is read in addition by one W manuscript and by M4. It is this last that may well be significant, for this manuscript often agrees with the Northern recension but is also perhaps the oldest Malayalam manuscript of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. The editor of the *Ayodhyākāṇḍa*, P. L. Vaidya, tended to regard it as an instance of contamination between the recensions. But more recently U. P. Shah, General Editor and editor of the *Uttarakāṇḍa*, has established the possibility of « an older M version » differing in some respects from the standard S tradition represented so uniformly in T G and M mss.¹⁴ However, Vaidya had already noted of M4 that « when it goes with N, it is invariably associated with the NE version » and declared that « The large number of * passages exclusive to the manuscript suggests that it represents a new version, and its agreement with NE support this point of view »¹⁵.

In theory at least we can divide the stereotyped expressions of the epics into three groups: those found equally in both epics (and so presumably belonging to the traditional stock drawn on by the authors of both), those found in the *Mahābhārata* but not in the *Rāmāyaṇa* or only in its later portions, and conversely those occurring in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and lacking in the *Mahābhārata* or only in late passages. For our present concerns the first group is clearly of least evidential value, but we may note that there are eleven or twelve such items on the list of verbal parallels, both set phrases such as *śataśo 'tha sahasraśaḥ* (8 times in *Rām.*, 94 in *Mbh.*) and standardised long compounds such as *sarvābharaṇabhūṣita* (10 times in *Rām.*, 12 in *Mbh.*). However, the distribution of the stereotyped phrases characteristic of the *Mahābhārata* is significant, for three or four occur in sequence but twelve at random — clear evidence that here the *Rāmāyaṇa* is borrowing from the *Mahābhārata* in general, and not from the *Rāmopākhyāna*, while the author of the *Rāmopākhyāna* has used such phrases naturally. One instance is not quite clearcut, which is the reason for the way I have given the figures; this is *pūrṇe varṣasahasre tu* which is a frequent *pāda* in the *Mahābhārata* (including 3.259.20a) but in the *Rāmāyaṇa* is confined to the *Bāla* and *Uttara kāṇḍas*. I would consider that these two books are drawing on the *Mahābhārata* repertoire of standard phrases.

By contrast, the distribution of the *Rāmāyaṇa* stock *pādas*, the largest of the three groups with 20 items, shows the bulk of them occurring in sequence against eight occurring at random. The major part of this group consists of personal epithets, which are naturally specific to

14. *Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa*, *Uttarakāṇḍa*, critically edited by U. P. Shah, Baroda, 1975, introduction pp. 5-6.

15. *Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa*, *Ayodhyākāṇḍa*, critically edited by P. L. Vaidya, Baroda, 1962, pp. XXII and XXI. Other instances of this manuscript going with the Northern recension in passages paralleled in the *Rāmopākhyāna* are 2.133* 2 (cf. 261.18cd), 1715* 5 pr. (cf. 261.31c) and 1744* 3 (cf. 261.33ab).

the narrative; these are *bhrātarau rāmalakṣmaṇau*, *rāmaḥ saumitriṇā saha*, *rāmaḥ śaṣṭrabhṛtām varaḥ*, *rāmo raktāntalocanaḥ*, *rāmeṇākliṣṭa-karmaṇā* (and genitive), *vaidehī janakātmajā*, *lakṣmaṇaḥ paravīraḥ*, *saumitriṇ mitranandanāḥ*, *lakṣmaṇasya ca dhīmataḥ*, *rāvaṇo rākṣas-eśvaraḥ*, *rāvaṇasya durātmanaḥ*, *rākṣasāḥ kāmārūpiṇaḥ*, *vānarāṇām mahātmanām* and *vasiṣṭho vāmadevaś ca*. The last of these does occur once elsewhere in the *Mahābhārata* (5.81.27a). So too does *rāmasyākliṣṭa-karmaṇaḥ*, but this also is obviously taken from the *Rāmāyaṇa*, for it occurs at 3.147.34b, in Hanumān's brief narration to Bhīma of the Rāma story. Similar are *rājā daśarathaś tadā* and the two long compounds, *kausalyānandavardhana* (also *Mbh.1.105.25b*) and *sumitrānandavardhana*. Most of the standardised *pādas* connected with speeches are common to both epics, but *vākyajñō vākyakovidam* is specific to the *Rāmāyaṇa* apart from its one occurrence in the *Rāmopākhyāna* (262.2d). Finally, there is the numerical *pāda caturdaśa sahasrāṇi*, which is really the only way of expressing this number and so probably not of great significance. But in general this group of phrases provides strong evidence of the direction of borrowing, especially in their distribution.

What are the divergences next which might suggest that the *Rāmopākhyāna* was independent of the *Rāmāyaṇa*? Professor Raghavan has noted and commented on many of these¹⁶; I will therefore only mention those where I wish to comment further. Several of them are instances of the addition of detail which is almost certainly secondary, although the possibility cannot be entirely excluded that they are drawn from another version of the Rāma story. I will leave aside for the present items occurring in *adhyāyas* 259 and 260.

The *Rāmopākhyāna* has Kaikeyī ornament herself and use beguiling words to get her way with Daśaratha (261.19-20) whereas the *Rāmāyaṇa* has her retire to her boudoir, if I may use that word in its original sense of a room to sulk in (2.9.42); this is a clear discrepancy. However, Daśaratha's reply is virtually identical in both the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the *Rāmopākhyāna* (2.10.10 and 261.22c-23b), so the discrepancy over Kaikeyī must presumably be seen as artistic licence. Similarly, in the *Rāmopākhyāna* (262.39) Sītā reenters the hermitage which she has never left in the *Rāmāyaṇa* version of Rāvaṇa's arrival and seizure of her.

An example of more developed details in the *Rāmopākhyāna* is the specification of Gokarṇa as the place to which Rāvaṇa goes to find Mārīca (261.54); this has very probably been elaborated out of the mention in *Rām.3.591** (read by most N mss. and M2) of Gokarṇa as the site of Rāvaṇa's penance. A further elaboration then occurs in the *Uttarakāṇḍa* (7.9.37 + 159*). Dr. U. P. Shah has already shown that there are other points at which the *Rāmopākhyāna* shows a more deve-

16. RAGHAVAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-25, with a direct quotation below of p. 17. For a different evaluation, see *The Mahābhārata*, vol. 2, translated and edited by J. A. B. van Buitenen, Chicago, 1975, pp. 210-13.

loped geography than the *Rāmāyaṇa*¹⁷. Such details well support the suggested chronology.

Insertions or transpositions of names of minor characters are not infrequent and in most cases not particularly significant. Thus the *Rāmopākhyāna* adds to the *Rāmāyaṇa* account of Kabandha's curse and punishment his former name, Viśvāvasu (263.38ab), and also has him cursed by Brahmā (38c) rather than by an ascetic as in the *Rāmāyaṇa* (3.67.3). In the next *adhyāya*, the *Rāmopākhyāna* names Sugrīva's ministers as Mainda, Dvidida, Hanūmān and Jāmbavān (264.23); the *Rāmāyaṇa* at the equivalent point has, as Raghavan accurately but misleadingly indicates, a « list which is completely different from that given in the *Rāmopākhyāna* ». In fact the *Rāmopākhyāna* takes these names from a longer list occurring in other contexts (*Rām*.4.25.32 etc.) and so what we actually have is an instance of transposition which demonstrates the closeness of the *Rāmopākhyāna* to the *Rāmāyaṇa* and not the converse. One list which is almost entirely new in the *Rāmopākhyāna* is that at 269.2 of eight *rākṣasas* and *piśācas*, but Vibhīṣaṇa does not kill any of them (as Raghavan says), he only destroys their invisibility and it is the *vānaras* who then kill them. Thus Vibhīṣaṇa remains largely non-combatant, as he is in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, and another of the divergences admitted by Raghavan disappears.

However, this last instance of addition of names does also point to the fact that the *Rāmopākhyāna* has elaborated on the battle scenes considerably within its basically shorter compass. It is worth noting that the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* has its equivalent in *adhyāyas* 267-275 (apart from 267.1-14, which transposes to the start of battle the material of *Rām*.4.38), for this is not far short of half the *Rāmopākhyāna*. Yet the *Rāmopākhyāna* has also abbreviated the material of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa* quite extensively; for example, it has nothing corresponding to the material of *Rām*.6.18-30 but moves straight from Rāvaṇa's sending of spies to Rāma's army besieging Laṅkā. Some of its elaboration consists of additions of names, such as we have just seen. Some consists of details of strategy after the manner of the *arthaśāstra*, such as Rāma setting up a formation of forces named after Uśanas to which Rāvaṇa opposes one named after Bṛhaspati (269.5-6). Some is developed out of slight hints in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, such as the water which enables Rāma and his allies to see the invisible *rākṣasas* (273.8-14, cf. 6.36.29 + 762*). Some arises out of the *Rāmopākhyāna*'s rearrangement of the order of incidents for the sake of concision, which has involved at times some telescoping of individual incidents.

To place against such divergences, none of which is of major significance, there are occasions on which the *Rāmopākhyāna* is scarcely intelligible without a prior knowledge of the story. Raghavan draws attention to the extreme brevity of its narrative of Bharata meeting

17. *Vālmiki-Rāmāyaṇa, Uttarakāṇḍa*, introduction pp. 31-37.

Rāma and receiving the sandals. There are also occasions when the actual wording of the *Rāmopākhyāna* is more explicable in the light of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. As a minor point, I might instance 267.4c where, in line with the *Mahābhārata* pattern of frequent epenthetic vocatives, the *Rāmopākhyāna* has changed *mahārājah* as one of a string of names in the nominative to such a vocative. More substantially, the use of the simile *śakraprahlādayor iva* at 273.18d seems to reflect *balavṛtrāv iva tau* at *Rām.6.75.31a* but to have emended it for the same reason as do some *Rāmāyaṇa* manuscripts and its commentators, that is to make the simile more logical.

Even where he has rearranged the incidents, the author of the *Rāmopākhyāna* keeps closely to the text of the *Rāmāyaṇa*; for example, the material of 6.35-40 is delayed to the end of *adhyāya* 272 and the start of *adhyāya* 273, and the second half of the *Kiṣkindhākāṇḍa*, including the search parties, is narrated in *adhyāya* 266, after some of the material from the *Sundarakāṇḍa* — a better order for a précis. Equally, briefer parallels of one or two *pādas* tend to be grouped, even when divorced from their *Rāmāyaṇa* context, as though the author of the *Rāmopākhyāna* had been thumbing through his copy of the *Rāmāyaṇa* for suitable phrases outside the immediate context (we should probably by this time be thinking of texts of the epic and no longer solely of recitations). For instance, 271.21ab and 25cd draw from incidents of fighting in the *Aranyakāṇḍa* to add to the main battle scenes. One may also note the extent to which the *Rāmopākhyāna* has drawn for its own summary in *adhyāya* 258 on the older parts of the *Rāmāyaṇa*; such borrowings have been assigned to the random part of the table of correspondences in *Rāmāyaṇa* order but in reality tend to confirm the closeness of the *Rāmopākhyāna* to the core of the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

If one considers simply the volume and position of the evidence, then one might consider that the *Bālakāṇḍa* was in existence by the time of the composition of the *Rāmopākhyāna* but not the *Uttarakāṇḍa*, since the *Rāmopākhyāna* has material in *adhyāyas* 258 and 260 corresponding to the *Bālakāṇḍa* but nothing at the end for the *Uttarakāṇḍa*, only *adhyāya* 259 at the beginning. However, an alternative, and equally possible, explanation is that the need for such a prologue was first felt by the author of the *Rāmopākhyāna* and that his example was followed by the redactors of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. For, in reality, the evidence of the *Rāmopākhyāna* supports only one section each in the *Bāla* and *Uttara kāṇḍas*, namely 1.14-17 (Rāma's genealogy and divine origin) and 7.2-3 and 9-10 (Rāvaṇa's genealogy and acquisition of near invincibility). The symmetry is striking, as is their juxtaposition in the *Rāmopākhyāna*, to the extent that *adhyāya* 258 contains both genealogies, *adhyāya* 259 narrates inter alia Brahmā's boon to Rāvaṇa, and *adhyāya* 260 narrates Brahmā's declaration of Viṣṇu's descent as Rāma. When to this is added their occurrence near the beginnings of the *kāṇḍas* concerned, the conclusion is irresistible that, far from the *Rāmopākhyāna* support-

ing their genuineness, it is the source whence the *Bāla* and *Uttara kāṇḍas* have been expanded.

Examination of the tables of correspondences further suggests that the *Rāmopākhyāna* has pieced together its account of Rāvaṇa's activities from stray indications in the earlier parts of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, for there is a striking lack of verbal similarity to *Uttara* 11-34. The fact that the *Rāmopākhyāna* equivalent of the *Uttarakāṇḍa* occurs at the beginning also indicates that it is not necessarily organic, a point which van Buitenen has recently stressed¹⁸, when commenting on Jacobi's views¹⁹. However, both he and Raghavan, in a similar context²⁰, do less than justice to Jacobi who, when claiming that the *Uttarakāṇḍa* was in existence by the time of the *Rāmopākhyāna*, adds the important qualification « wenigstens die Rāvaṇeīs », recognising that therefore as the only real point of agreement between the *Rāmopākhyāna* and the *Uttarakāṇḍa*.

Jacobi also argued from the resemblance between *Mbh.* 3.262.38 and *Rām.* 3.45.40 that the *Rāmopākhyāna* knew a form of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in which the sargas closed with verses in longer metres²¹. However, this particular section of the *Rāmāyaṇa* has obviously been expanded from a simpler original²², with quite possibly a change of metre in the process, and thus there is at least a possibility that here the *Rāmopākhyāna* is based on an older form of the text than that extant. In general, there is no definite evidence that the *Rāmopākhyāna* was acquainted with the verses in longer metres.

Nor can we be certain how far the *Rāmopākhyāna* was familiar with the passages expanded or interpolated in the second stage of growth of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. That it shows correspondences to expanded passages but not to pure interpolated episodes is indicative of its own nature as a summary rather than of any real distinction between the two types. Indeed, to the extent that expansion first occurs at major turning points in the story, the *Rāmopākhyāna* is more likely to have material corresponding to such parts of the *Rāmāyaṇa*; the limitation is that its nature as a summary prevents us knowing just what stage the text had reached. For example, the *Rāmopākhyāna* mentions at 261.29 Daśaratha's death after Rāma's departure for the forest, narrated in *Rām.* 2.58, but it lacks Daśaratha's narration of his former misdeed and the resultant curse developed at length in *Rām.* 2.57-58. This material may either have been lacking in the *Rāmāyaṇa* version followed by the

18. *The Mahābhārata*, vol. 2, tr. by van Buitenen, p. 209.

19. JACOBI, *Das Rāmāyaṇa*, Bonn, 1893, pp. 73-4.

20. RAGHAVAN, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

21. JACOBI, *loc. cit.* Further discussion in E. W. HOPKINS, *The Great Epic of India*, New York, 1901, p. 63, SUKTHANKAR, *op. cit.*, pp. 473-4, and VAN BUITENEN, *tr.*, *The Mahābhārata*, vol. 2, pp. 208-9.

22. See my article *Stereotyped Expressions in the Rāmāyaṇa*, « Journal of the American Oriental Society », 90, 1970, pp. 210-227, esp. p. 223.

Rāmopākhyāna or have been dropped as extraneous to the main story. In the same way, the *Rāmopākhyāna* gives at 264.35-38 Vālin's slaying by Rāma's arrow narrated at *Rām.* 4.17 but, except perhaps obliquely in 38a (*garhayitvā sa kākutsthām*), not the elaborate ethical justification in that and the next sarga included in the *Rāmāyaṇa* as Rāma's moral perfection came to be stressed²³. Examples of interpolated episodes completely lacking in the *Rāmopākhyāna* are Bharadvāja's entertainment of Bharata's army (*Rām.* 2.85) and Agastya's welcome to Rāma and presentation of divine weapons (*Rām.* 3.11).

As a more general point, there is the fact that the major part of the *Rāmopākhyāna* still sees Rāma as human, but as an exemplary figure; again this is the position reached by the middle of the second stage of the *Rāmāyaṇa*'s growth. The only exception is the short *adhyāya* 260 where Viṣṇu incarnates as Rāma, while the other gods, led by Śakra, beget heroic sons on monkeys and bears. Elsewhere, Rāma and Rāvaṇa are both compared to Indra. In particular, at *Mbh.* 3.275.38c Rāma is merely compared to Indra, where in the *Rāmāyaṇa* his divinity is revealed at 6.105-8²⁴.

We may therefore assign the composition of the *Rāmopākhyāna* to a period subsequent to most of this second stage, though prior to the composition of the *Bāla* and *Uttara kāṇḍas*. Possibly then the order of composition was: firstly, the main body of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and its earlier additions, followed by the main part of the *Rāmopākhyāna* (*adhyāyas* 261-275), to which was added its preamble (*adhyāyas* 258-260), subsequently expanded into the *Bāla* and *Uttara kāṇḍas* of the *Rāmāyaṇa*. At any rate, presumably Rāvaṇa's genealogy was included in the *Rāmopākhyāna* earlier than in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, since otherwise more of the story of the *Uttarakāṇḍa* would have been included (this is after all an inclusion for the sake of completeness), and the *Rāmāyaṇa* then included and expanded the material as the *Uttarakāṇḍa*.

Is the reality of the situation then more complex than any of Weber's fourfold alternatives? Not only is there evidence that each has been the source of the other by turns, but the possibility cannot be totally excluded that the *Rāmopākhyāna* is based not only on Vālmiki's *Rāmāyaṇa* (or more exactly on one particular version of it, as suggested above) but also on another independent form of the Rāma story. As van Buitenen suggests, although he puts the argument differently²⁵, this

23. On both passages in the *Rāmāyaṇa* see my article *Religious Attitudes in Vālmiki's Rāmāyaṇa*, «Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society», 1976, no. 2. Van Buitenen sees the second as the *Rāmopākhyāna* being «more straightforward» and thus older than the *Rāmāyaṇa* (*tr.*, *The Mahābhārata*, vol. 2, p. 211). It may well be more allusive and so later, despite his arguments at p. 210.

24. See my article *Rāmo dharmabhṛtām varaḥ* in «Indologica Taurinensia», V, p. 57.

25. *The Mahābhārata*, *tr.*, vol. 2, pp. 209-14, esp. p. 213.

might explain how for example Rāvaṇa's wooing and Avindhya's / Tri-jatā's dream show an older form in the *Rāmopākhyāna* but are elaborated in the *Rāmāyaṇa*; but alternative explanations are equally plausible, as Raghavan demonstrates²⁶.

However, outside the *Bāla* and *Uttara kāṇḍas*, reverse borrowing is most exceptional, if indeed it occurs at all. The various types of stereotyped expression amply confirm the direction of borrowing established by the general lists of parallels, for those characteristic of the *Mahābhārata* occur more at random while those characteristic of the *Rāmāyaṇa* occur in the *Rāmopākhyāna* mostly in sequence with the narration of the story. It has even been possible to demonstrate that the *Rāmopākhyāna* is closest to the extant NE recension but with some links also with the Southern Recension. The obvious conclusion, reinforced by consideration of the manuscript M4, is that the *Rāmopākhyāna* is based on an older form of the Northern recension (better represented now in NE than in NW or W) which had not yet diverged as far from the Southern as now. Again we may note that the differences between the Northern and Southern recensions in the *Bāla* and *Uttara kāṇḍas* are less than in the five older books. Supposed divergences of subject matter are not particularly significant, although there has been some shift of emphasis with the fuller treatment of the *Yuddhakāṇḍa*.

Altogether it is quite clear that Sukthankar's conclusions were entirely valid and can indeed be taken further. Not only is the *Rāmopākhyāna* based on the *Rāmāyaṇa* but in general it is closer to the NE recension. And its composition can be assigned, in terms of the stages of growth of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, to the latter part of the second stage.

26. RAGHAVAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 18-19.

<i>Mbh.3 (RŪ)</i>	<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>
258.2abc	āśramād rākṣasendreṇa rāvaṇena vihāyasā / māyām āsthāya tarasā sā hṛtā rākṣasendreṇa rāvaṇena vihāyasā / māyām āsthāya vipulām
2d	hatvā gṛdhrāṃ jaṭāyuṣam
3c	baddhvā setuṃ samudrasya
4b	kiṃvīryaḥ kiṃparākramāḥ
5d	rāmayākliṣṭakarmaṇaḥ
7ab	abhavaṃ tasya catvāraḥ putrā dharmārthakovidāḥ rājāṇaḥ putrā mahatmanas catvāro jajāire prthak
9d	rāmasya mahiṣiṇ priyām
11b	sākṣād devaḥ prajāpatiḥ
12ab	pulastyo nāma tasyāśin mānaso dayitaḥ sutaḥ mānaso brāhmaṇaḥ putraḥ pulastyo nāma brahmaṛṣiḥ prajāpatisutaḥ prabhūḥ / pulastyo nāma brahmaṛṣiḥ
12c	tasya vaiśravaṇo nāma
15a	pitāmahas tu prītātmā
259.4d	nṛtagitaviśārādāḥ
6c	lokapāloman putrān
13ab	sarve vedavidāḥ śūrāḥ sarve sucaritavratāḥ sarve vedavidāḥ śūrāḥ sarve lokahite ratāḥ
20abc	pūrṇe varṣasahasre tu śīraś chittvā daśānaṇaḥ / juhoty agnau durādharṣaḥ ...daśānaṇaḥ / pūrṇe varṣasahasre tu śīraś cāgnau juhāva saḥ
23	yad agnau hutam sarvaṃ śīraś te mahadipsayā tathaiva tāni te dehe bhaviṣyanti yathepsitam hutāni yāni śīrṣāṇi pūrvam agnau tvayānagha punaś tāni bhaviṣyanti tathaiva tava rākṣasa vibhiṣaṇam uvāca ha
29b	paramāpadgatasyāpi nādharme me matir bhavet
30	asīkṣitaṃ ca bhagavan brahmāstraṃ pratibhātu me paramāpadgatasyāpi dharme mama matir bhavet asīkṣitaṃ ca brahmāstraṃ bhagavan pratibhātu me
	cf. 3.64.9abc = 4.6.3d cf. 1.1.42d [Su] 6.101.9d 3.32.2b [Su] id. (N v.l.) = 2.66.26d etc. [Su] cf. 1.17.10ab = 3.48.25d [Su] 7.2.4d cf. 5.21.6cd 7.2.4bc 7.3.7c 7.10.13a 4.50.17b 1.71.7c cf. 1.17.14ab [Su] 1.72.21b cf. 7.10.10bcd a) also = 1.45.6a etc. cf. 7.10.21 = 7.10.29b cf. 7.167* [J.]

31	yasmāḍ rākṣasayonau te jātasyāmitrakarṣana	= 7.10.30 [J.]
34ab	nādharme ramate buddhir amaratvaṃ dadāmi te	(with N v.l.)
	vimanam puṣpakam tasya jahārākramya rāvaṇaḥ	cf. 7.15.29cd
36ab	puṣpakam tasya jagrāha vimānaṃ jayalakṣaṇam	3.30.14cd
	vimānaṃ puṣpakam tasya kāmagaṃ vai jahāra yaḥ	cf. 7.10.6ab [Su]
260.2b	vibhiṣaṇas tu dharmātmā satāṃ dharmam anusmaran	= 5.16.3d
2cd	vibhiṣaṇas tu dharmātmā nityaṃ dharmaparaḥ śuciḥ	cf. 1.14.7ab
7a	daśagrivo mahābalaḥ	1.16.2c
7d	avadhyo varadānena kṛto bhagavatā purā	1.16.13d (N v.l.)
	tvayā tasmai varo dattiaḥ prītena bhagavan purā	[Su]
8b	viṣṇoḥ sahāyān rīkṣiṣu	= 3.31.7b etc.
10a	kāmārūpabalānvitāḥ	= 1.39.4a etc.
12b	devagandharvadanāvāḥ	3.24.27d
13b	pitāmahavacaḥ śrutvā	= 1.50* 1 post.,
	sālatālaśīlāyudhāḥ	6.57.13b
13d	sarve yuddhaviśāradaḥ	1.16.3b
261.2b	vāyuvegasamā jave	= 1.69.30f etc.
1243*	bhrātarau rāmalakṣmaṇau	cf. 1.7.2 [Mbh. CE]
	vṛṣṭir jayanto vijayaḥ siddhārtho rāṣṭravardhanaḥ	1.53* 5 [SI]
	asoko dharmapālās ca sumantrās cāṣṭamo 'bhavat	cf. 2.3.11cd [Su]
	dhṛṣṭir jayanto vijayaḥ siddhārtho arthasādhakaḥ asoko	= 6.106.2d
	mantrapālās ca sumantrās cāṣṭamo 'bhavat	2.1.32b
6b	ramayām āsa hi prajāḥ	2.20* 6 pr. [R.]
9bc	mattamātāṅgagāminam / dirghabāhūṃ mahoraskam	= 1.72.17b
	dirghabāhūṃ mahāsattvaṃ mattamātāṅgagāminam	cf. 1.11.3c, 11c [Su]
9d	nīlakuṇṭitamūrdhajaṃ	cf. 2.133* 1 [SI]
10d	bṛhaspatisamaṃ matau	
11a	sarvānūraktaprakṛtiṃ	
13b	kausalyānandavardhanam	
15c	saṃbhārāḥ saṃbhriyāntām me	
17cd	āśviṣas tvāṃ saṃkruddhas caṇḍo daśati durbhage	
	āśviṣas tvāṃ daśatu mūḍhe paṇḍitamānini	

<i>Mbh.3 (RU)</i>	<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>
18	subhaḡ khalu kausalyā yasyāḡ putro 'bhiṣekṣyate kuto hi tava saubhāgyaṃ yasyāḡ pulro na rājyabhāḡ sarvābharanabhuṣitā : sarvābharanabhuṣitāḡ avadhyo vadhyatām ko 'dya vadhyāḡ ko 'dya vimucyatām pṛthivyām rājarājo 'smi cāturvarṇasya rakṣitā cf. pṛthivyām rājarājo 'smi samrāt sarvamahikṣitām ābhīṣecanikaṃ yat te rāmārtham upakalpitam vanam gacchatu rāghavaḡ
19b	
22cd	
1245* 1	(2nd pāda (dravyaṃ in a)
25ab	
25d	
28d	
29b	
31a	
31c	
33ab	
35ab	
35d	
36d	
38cd	
39d	
40b	
40c	
41d	
42b	
42cd	
43a	

= 2.8.3ab and 135*
[Su]
2.9.39b

cf.

2.10.10ab [J.]
= 5.33.11b

= 2.195* 1 [SI]

= 2.260* 2 [SI]

= 2.8.22b (v.l.)

= 5.31.17d [Su]

= 2.92.8b etc.

= 2.4.3b etc.

= 2.73.2a

= 2.1715* 5 pr.

cf.

2.1744* 3 [SI]

cf.

2.77.6ab

= 2.64.22d

2.77.6c

cf.

2.107.12cd

= 3.4.16d [Su]

= 2.10.28b

= 3.60.2c [Su]

cf. 3.15.2d

= 1.1.36b

= 3.29.1b

cf.

3.25.22abc

= 5.35.16ab [Su]

= 3.30.2a

262c	uvāca praśritam vākyam	=	3.12.9c
2d	vākyajño vakyakovidam	=	2.28.5d etc.
3b	kaccit kṣemaṃ pure tava	=	3.645* 4 [J.]
12c	apakrānte ca kākutsthe	=	3.38.17a and 749* 1 pr. [Su]
14	ity evam ukto mārīcaḥ kṛtvodakam athātmanah rāvaṇam purato yāntam anvagacchat suduḥkhitah evam uktvā tu paruṣaṃ mārīco rāvaṇaṃ tataḥ gacchāvety abravīd dīno bhayād rātrīncaraṇabhoḥ mṛgaś ca bhūtvā mārīcas taṃ deśam upajagmatuḥ mṛgo bhūtvāśramadvāri rāmasya vicāra ha hā site lakṣmapety evaṃ cukrośārtasvareṇa ha hā site lakṣmapety evam ākruśya tu mahāśvanam viśeṣaṃ vā hutāśanam	cf.	
16cd		cf.	3.40.1 (also 761*)
22cd		cf.	3.40.12cd
27d		cf.	3.42.18ab [J.] 3.43.34b (N v.l.) [Su]
30ab	etasmīnn antare rakṣo rāvaṇaḥ pratyadṛśyata etaḍ antaram āśādyā daśagrīvaḥ pratāpavān abhavyo bhavyarūpeṇa	cf.	3.847*
30c	bhasmacchanna ivānalaḥ	=	3.44.9a [J.]
30d	bhasmacchanna ivānalaḥ		4.26.14d
32b	svarūpaṃ pratipadya ca		3.47.8c
33b	rāvaṇo nāma viśrutaḥ		3.46.2c (cf. 3.45.22c)
33cd	mama laṅkā purī nāmnā ramyā pāre mahodadheḥ laṅkā nāma samudrasya madhye mama mahāpurī mama pāre samudrasya laṅkā nāma purī śubhā	cf.	3.45.25ab [J.] 3.46.10ab [J.] 3.45.27d (N v.l.)
34c	bhāryā me bhava suśroṇī		
38	katham hi pītvā mādhvikaṃ pītvā ca madhumādhavīm lobhaṃ sauvīrake kuryān nārī kācid iti smare surāgrasyaauvirakayor yad antaram tad antaraṃ dāśarathes tavaiva ca rudatīm rāma rāmeti	cf.	3.45.40cd [I.v.] [J.]
41c	gṛdhrarājo mahāvīryaḥ		3.50.12ab
263.1c	cakarta nakharair bhīṣam / pakṣaṭuṇḍaprahāraiś ca		3.48.3d
4bc	... pakṣaṭuṇḍanakhair muhuḥ / cakara rāvaṇaṃ saṃkhye...	cf.	3.984* 1-2
4f	giṇīḥ prastravaṇair iva	=	6.55.70d

<i>Mbh.3 (RU)</i>	<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>
8ab	sā dadarśa giriprasthe pañca vānarapungavān dadarśa giriśṛṅgasthān pañca vānarapungavān praviveśa puriṇ laṅkā katham utsṛīya vaidehiṇ vane rākṣasasevite vihāya sitāṃ vijane vane rākṣasasevite api jīvati vaidehi sa dadarśa tadā grdhrān nihataṃ parvatopamam tataḥ parvatakūṭābhaṃ... / dadarśa patitaṃ bhūmau vyapaviddhabṛsighaṭam rāṇaḥ saumitriṇā saha meghaparvatasamkāśaṃ viṣaṇṇaś cābravid rāmaṃ drakṣyāmi pṛthivirājye pitṛpaitāmahe sthitam pratilabhya ca kākutstha pitṛpaitāmaḥ mahīm sumitrānandavardhana rāvaṇena hṛtā sitā sugrīvaṃ abhigacchasya eṣa paṃpā śivajāḥ haṃsakāraṇḍavāyuta paśya paṃpāṃ śubhajalāṃ... haṃsakāraṇḍavāyutaṃ saṃvasaty atra sugrīvaś caturbhiḥ sacivaiḥ saha nivasaty ātmavān vīraś caturbhiḥ saha vānaraḥ vālino hemaṇālinaḥ ... draśāsi jānakīm / ... vidito rāvaṇālayaḥ gamiṣyati varārohaṃ nirmalāṃ rāvaṇālaye prabhūtakamalotpalaṃ jagāma manasā priyāṃ sugrīvaṃ plavageśvaram tārāṃ tārādhipānāṃ tārā tārādhipaprabhā rāmo daśarathātmajaḥ maindaś ca dvividaś caiva haṇūmāś cānilātmajaḥ maindaś ca dvividaś caiva haṇūmāṃ jāmbavān nalaḥ jāmbavān ṛkṣarājaś ca kā tvarā maraṇe punaḥ
1260* 4 pr.	cf. 3.52.1cd [Su]
11ab	= 3.52.11c cf. 3.55.14cd [Su] 3.56.9a
13c	cf. 3.63.9a+c
15cd	= 3.58.7b [Su] 3.7.11b etc. 4.36.14a
22b	cf. 3.1266* 3 [S]
24b	3.1266* 8 [S]
25c	1.1.23d etc.
27c	= 3.67.19a [Su]
29cd	3.71.25a cf. (NE vv.II.) 4.1.43a+d [Su]
1263* post.	cf. 3.68.12cd [J.] 4.14.15b
39a	cf. 3.1298* [S]
39c	4.25.14d
40ab	= 4.29.5d [Su]
41ab	4.22.2b 4.20.1d 4.16.1ab = 4.39.9b etc.
41d	cf. 4.25.32cd [Su]
42b+d	= 6.28.1c = 4.331* 2 [Su]
264.1b	
2d	
13b	
18b	
20b	
21b	
23ab	
23c	
27d	

<i>Mbh.3 (RU)</i>	<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>
30d	śālātāśālīyudhau : śālātāśālīyudhāḥ 3.24.27d
31a	ubhau jaghnatur anyonyam : jaghnatur samare 'nyonyam 4.12.18c
32d	puspitāv iva kiṃśukau = 6.35.9d [Su]
34ab	sa mālāyā tadā vīraḥ śuśubhe kaṇṭhasaktayā sa tathā śuśubhe śrīmān latayā kaṇṭhasaktayā sa bhīnamamābhīhato vaktrāc choṇitam udvaman sa vāliputrābhīhato vaktrāc choṇitam udvaman cf. 4.12.37ab [Sl]
37ab	cf. 4.47.19ab [Su]
41c	śōkavanikābhyaśe : śōkavanikāmadhye 5.12.11c etc.
42b	tāpasiveśadhārīṇi : tāpasiveśadhārīṇim 5.415* 3 [Su]
49a	āryāḥ khādāta māṃ śīghraṃ : kāmāṇ khādāta māṃ sarvāḥ 5.22.7c [Sl]
52a	tasyās tad vacanam śrutvā = 5.32.1a etc.
53b	trijāṭā nāma rākṣasī 5.25.4c
54d	śrṇu cedam vaco mama = 7.11.12d, 47.9d
55ab	avindhyo nāma medhāvī vṛddho rākṣasapungavaḥ avindhyo nāma medhāvī vidvān rākṣasapungavaḥ cf. 5.35.12ab [Sl]
61ab	svapnā hi sumahāghorā dṛṣṭā me 'niṣṭadarśanāḥ svapno hy adya mayā dṛṣṭo dāruṇo romaharṣanaḥ cf. 5.25.6ab
63b	kālopahatacetanāḥ = 3.47.27b
64cd	asakṛt kharayukte tu rathe nrtyann iva sthitaḥ rathena kharayuktena
65a	kumbhakarnādayas ceme : raktamālyānulepanaḥ
65d	raktamālyānulepanāḥ
66	śvetātaparāḥ soṣṇiṣaḥ śūklamālyavibhūṣanaḥ śvetāparvatam ārūḍha eka eva vibhūṣanaḥ ... śvetacchatro vibhūṣanaḥ / śūklamālyāmbaradharah śvetāparvatam ārūḍhas tv eka eva vibhūṣanaḥ cf. 5.614* 1-2 [Sl]
265.4b	sumṛṣṭamanikuṇḍalāḥ 5.617* 1 [Sl]
4d	vasanta iva mūrṭimān 1.13.13d
5acd	sa kalpavyākṣasadiśo... / śmaśānacaityadrumavad bhūṣito 'pi bhayaṃkaraḥ sa kalpavyākṣapratimo... / śmaśānacaityapratimo bh. 'pi bh. = 5.520* 1 post. cf. 5.520* [Sl]
8ab	sīte paryāptam etiāvat kṛto bhartur anugrahaḥ sīte paryāptam etiāvad bhartṛsneho nidarśitaḥ cf. 5.22.16ab [Su]

11ab	caturdaśa piśacānāṃ koṭyo me vacane sthitāḥ daśa rakṣasakoṭyaś ca dvāvimśatir athaparāḥ	cf.	3.53.14ab [SI] 3.1056* 4 [SI]
11c	dviś tāvat puruṣādānāṃ : dviś tāvac ca piśacānām		
17cd	tiṣṇam antarataḥ kṛtvā tam uvāca niśacaram tiṣṇam antarataḥ kṛtvā rāvaṇaṃ pratyabhāṣata tiṣṇam antarataḥ kṛtvā pratyuvāca śucismitā	cf.	3.54.1cd [Su] 5.19.3ab [J.] 5.19.6a [Su]
21a	na caivopayiki bhāryā : nāham aupayiki bhāryā	cf.	5.23.9cd
25cd	dadṛṣe svasitā snigdhā kālī vyāliva mūrdhani (veṇi in b) dadṛṣe kampini veṇi vyāliva parisarpatī	=	4.27.1c [Su] 4.29.6a
266.1c	vasan mālyavataḥ pṛṣṭhe : dṛṣṭvā ca vimalaṃ vyoma		
1d	dadarśa vimalaṃ nabhaḥ		
2ab	sa dṛṣṭvā vimale vyomni nirmalaṃ śaśalakṣaṇam pāṇḍuraṃ gaganam dṛṣṭvā vimalaṃ candramaṇḍalam	cf.	above and 4.29.2ab [SI] 4.29.48d
10c	netayo vālimārgena : mā vālipatham anvagāḥ	=	4.36.37b etc. 4.35.3d
13d	sugrivaḥ plavagādhipaḥ : sugrīvo vānaresvaraḥ	cf.	4.34.3ab 5.59.11b
15b	sugrīvo vānarādhipaḥ : sugrīvo na nirghṛṇaḥ		
16ab	nāsmi lakṣmaṇa durmedhā na kṛtaghno na nirghṛṇaḥ naivākṛtjñāḥ sugrīvo na śaṭho nāpi dāruṇaḥ		
26b	sphītaṃ madhuvanaṃ mahat : dṛṣṭvā madhuvanaṃ mahat	cf.	5.60.3acd 1.64.21b
28bcd	mene sa kṛtakṛtyatām / kṛtārthānām hi bhṛtyānām etad bhavati ceṣṭitam avyayaṃ kṛtakāryasya... / akāryam api kartavyaṃ kim aṅga punar idṛśam	=	5.24.4d etc. 4.58.7b 5.35.47b 4.55.2a
30d	rāmalaṣṇaṇasamnidhau : nāham jīvitum utsahe		
35d	nāham bahuyojanam āyatām : bahuyojanam āyate		
38b	timinakrajhaṣāvāsam : timinakrajhaṣākule		
44c	sampātir nāma tasyāham : sampātir nāma nāmnā		
48a	nirdagdhapakṣaḥ patito hy aham asmin mahāgirau	cf.	4.57.7ab [SI]
49cd	nirdagdhapakṣaḥ patito vindhye 'haṃ vānarottamāḥ		
52ab	kaḥ sa rāmaḥ kathaṃ sitā jāṭayus ca kathaṃ hataḥ kathaṃ jāṭayur nibataḥ kaś ca rāmo jāṭayusaḥ	cf.	4.1166* [SI] 7.94.18d
55d	na me 'sty atra vicāraṇā	=	5.28.33c
57e	śatayojanavistīrṇaṃ	=	(cf. 5.63.8ab)

58ab	tatra sitā mayā dṛṣṭā rāvaṇāntahpure sati tatra dṛṣṭā mayā sitā rāvaṇāntahpure sati	cf.	5.63.10ab [Su]
61c	sarvasākhāmrgendrena		6.17.12a (cf. 6.19.28c)
67c	kṣiptām iṣikām kākasya	=	5.38.4c
67d	citrakūṭe mahāgirau		and 1361* 2 pr. [SI]
267.1d	sugrīvacanāt tadā	=	2.84.21b [Su]
2ab	vṛtaḥ koṭisahasreṇa vānarāṇāṃ tarasvinām	cf.	4.7.15b
4cd	vṛtaḥ koṭisahasreṇa vānarāṇāṃ adṛśyata golāṅgulo mahārāja gavākṣo bhīmadarśanaḥ golāṅgulo mahārājo gavākṣo bhīmavikramaḥ golāṅgulo mahākāyo gavākṣo bhīmadarśanaḥ	cf.	4.38.18cd etc. [Su]
6a	panaso nāma medhāvī		4.38.18ab [Su]
8cd	koṭisatasahasreṇa jāmbavān pratyadṛśyata vṛtaḥ śatasahasraś ca jāmbavān pratyadṛśyata	cf.	6.32.21ab [Su]
9a	ete cānye ca bahavo		4.38.20b
9b	hariyūthapayūthapāḥ	cf.	4.724* 3
10b	siṃhāṇāṃ iva nardatām	=	4.38.32c
11c	śaradābhrapratikāśāḥ	=	4.13.4d
12a	utpatantaḥ patantaś ca		2.95.34d
15d	sugrivasahitas tadā		6.57.35c
16b	hanūmān mārūtātmajaḥ		6.4.25c
17a	baddhagodhāṅgulitrāṇau		7.83.7b
18b	śālatāśilāyudham	=	6.3.6b etc.
20b	bahumūlaphaleṣu ca	=	1.21.8a
21d	kṣārodam atha sāgaram		(cf. 2.20.30a)
22c	velāvanam samāsādyā		3.24.27d
22d	nivāsam akartat tadā		6.15.31d
35ab	brūhi kṛp te karomy atra sāhāyyaṃ puruṣarṣabha avaśyaṃ tava sāhāyyaṃ mayā kāryaṃ viśeṣataḥ	cf.	4.39.38b
37c	śaraś tvāṃ śoṣayīṣyāmi		6.4.75a
	śāgarāṃ śoṣayīṣyāmi		6.4.71d
			6.280* 1 [SI]
			6.238* pr.

40	yadi dāsyāmi te mārgaṃ saumyaśya vrajato 'jñāyā anye 'py ājñāpāyisanti mām evaṃ dhanuṣo balāt anye 'pi balavanto mām daṇḍam udyamya rāghava gatyartham iha mārgaṃ ca dāpāyisanti tejasa asti tv atra nalo nāma vānaraḥ śilpisaṃmataḥ tvaṣṭur devasya tanayo balavān viśvakarmaṇaḥ ayaṃ saumya nalo nāma tanujo viśvakarmaṇaḥ pitṛ dattavaraḥ śrīmān pratīmo viśvakarmaṇaḥ sarvaṃ tad dhārayiṣyāmi : tam ahaṃ dhārayiṣyāmi daśayojanavistāraṃ āyataṃ śatayojanam daśayojanavistīrṇaṃ śatayojanam āyatam nalasetur iti khyātāḥ caturbhiḥ sacivaiḥ saha : caturbhiḥ saha rākṣasaiḥ	cf. 6.258* 8-9 [SI] cf. 6.15.8 6.15.9c = N vv.ll. of 6.15.20ab [Su] = 6.306* 6 pr. 6.10.12d and 11.5b [SI] = 6.13.9b [Su] = 6.16.9b,22b [Su] cf. 6.330* 5 = 7.11.20c 7.5.26a 6.31.67a [Su] 6.31.66a = 5.19.10ab [Su] cf. 5.19.10cd [Su] = 6.31.68a [SI] = 6.31.56ab [J.] cf. 6.31.71ab = 6.17.5b etc. [Su] cf. 6.31.73cd [Su] = 6.31.50c cf. 4.38.13ab
41		
42c		
44cd		
45a		
46d		
49b		
52b		
53ab		
54c		
268.2d		
10a		
10b		
11		
15a		
16cd		
17ab		
17d		
18bc		
21c		
27cd		

32b	rākṣasāḥ kāmārūpiṇaḥ	:	māśarāśipratikāśam	=	5.18.4b etc.
34a	sa māśarāśisadṛśaiḥ	:	nakhair dantaiś ca vīṇāṃ	=	5.8.26a [R.]
36c	tatra vānararākṣasāḥ	:	tadā vānararākṣasām	=	6.32.29d [Su]
269.5b	ravano niryayav atha	:	niryayau rāvapo mohād	=	6.34.1b.2d
37b	svabāhubalaṃ āśritāḥ	:	sa samprahāras tumulo	=	6.83.37c
9d	sa samprahāro vavīdhe	:	yathā devāsūre purā	=	2.993* 1 post.
10a	purā devāsūre yathā	:	saktiśūlaparāśvadhaiḥ	=	6.32.32a
10d	śaktiśūlāśivṛṣṭibhiḥ	:	yal lokāḥ sacarācarāḥ	=	6.32.27d etc.
11b	v.l. lokā vai sacarācarāḥ	:	hṛtottamāṅgaṃ saumitre	=	6.32.28b
14d	gadayā bhīmavegayā	:	cf. tāṃ dṛṣṭvā nihataṃ samkhye	=	6.88.53b
270.2b	hṛtottamāṅgo dadṛṣe	:	tataḥ śabdo mahān āsit tumulo lomaharṣaṇaḥ	=	6.42.34b v.l.
4c	tāṃ dṛṣṭvā nihataṃ samkhye	:	tatrasīt sumahad yuddhaṃ tumulaṃ lomaharṣaṇam	=	6.75.22c
5a	cf. tāṃ dṛṣṭvā nihataṃ bhūmau	:	anyonyam abhidhāvātām	=	7.27.42a
9ab	tataḥ śabdo mahān āsit tumulo lomaharṣaṇaḥ	:	saskandhaviṭapair drumaḥ	=	6.44.30a
9d	tatrasīt sumahad yuddhaṃ tumulaṃ lomaharṣaṇam	:	hanūmān mārutātmajaḥ (cf. 11d)	=	6.33.16ab
13d	tatas tāṃ nihataṃ dṛṣṭvā dhūmrākṣaṃ rākṣasottamam	:	dhūmrākṣaṃ nihataṃ dṛṣṭvā	=	6.33.5b
14d	dhūmrākṣaṃ nihataṃ dṛṣṭvā	:	hataśeṣā niśācarāḥ	=	6.42.29d [Su]
15ab	dhūmrākṣaṃ rākṣasarṣabhaḥ	:	sayānam atinidṛlūṃ kumbhakarṇaṃ abodhayat	=	6.42.29b etc. [Su]
17b	hataśeṣā niśācarāḥ	:	nidṛvāsasamāviṣṭaḥ kumbhakarṇo vibodhyatām	=	6.42.36a and
20cd	sayānam atinidṛlūṃ kumbhakarṇaṃ abodhayat	:	kumbhakarṇaṃ mahābalaṃ	=	6.42.17b
21f	ya inam dāruṇaṃ kālaṃ na jāniṣe mahābhayaṃ	:	mayā hy apahrītā bhāryā sītā...	=	6.42.36b [Su]
22cd	sukhinas tvam na jāniṣe mama rāmākṛtaṃ bhayaṃ	:	parivārya samantataḥ	=	6.48.11cd
24ab	mayā hy apahrītā bhāryā sītā...	:	kumbhakarṇasya rākṣasāḥ	=	6.48.12d, 53.28d
271.2b	parivārya samantataḥ	:	kumbhakarṇena rākṣasā	=	6.50.12cd [SI]
4b	mayā hy apahrītā bhāryā sītā...	:	saumitir mitranandanāḥ	=	6.1099* 3 post.
5b	mayā hy apahrītā bhāryā sītā...	:	lakṣmaṇaḥ paravirahā	=	4.59.1d
10b	mayā hy apahrītā bhāryā sītā...	:		=	6.55.74d [Su]
10d	mayā hy apahrītā bhāryā sītā...	:		=	6.48.34b
11d	mayā hy apahrītā bhāryā sītā...	:		=	6.54.26b
		:		=	6.72.31b etc.
		:		=	6.59.66d etc.

<i>Mbh.3 (RU)</i>		<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>	
12d	rudhireṇa samukṣitāḥ	a)	6.75.17b (cf. 52.25b)
21ab	tataḥ sutumulaṃ yuddham abhavaḥ lomahaṣaṇam cf. tad babhīvādbhutaṃ yuddhaṃ tumulaṃ romaḥaṣaṇam		= 4.12.17a = 3.24.28ab [J.] = 3.70.6d etc.
21d	lakṣmaṇasya ca dhimataḥ	cf.	cf. 3.25.14d
25cd	pramāṭhinam abhidruṭya pramamātha mahābalaḥ pramamātha pramāṭhinam	cf.	cf. 6.56.2ab [Su]
272.1ab	tataḥ śrutvā hataṃ saṃkhye kumbhakarṇaṃ saḥānugam śrutvā vinīhataṃ saṃkhye kumbhakarṇaṃ mahābalaṃ sugrivaṃ ca salaḥkṣmaṇam		= 6.9.6b = 6.67.37b = 3.27.12d = 6.4.11d etc.
2d	lakṣmaṇaṃ śubhalakṣaṇam		6.46.18b
9d	simhaḥ kṣudramiṃṣaṃ yatha		= 6.68.4b etc. [Su]
10d	śataśo 'tha sahasraśaḥ		= 6.35.16a
23d	pragṛhya mahatīṃ śilāḥ		cf.
24d	bhṛatarau rāmalakṣmaṇau		6.36.3abc
26b	tau virau śarajālena baddhau...		= 6.39.31d v.l. [Su]
273.2ab	suṣeṇamainadvividaiḥ kumudenaṅgadena ca / hanūmannīlātāis ca		= 6.36.2cd
4abc	nīladvividamaindās ca suṣeṇasumukhaṅgadāḥ / tūrṇaṃ hanumatā sārdham	b)	cf. 6.75.28cd 6.75.31a = 6.75.1b [Su] = 6.75.3d v.l., = 76.5b v.l., etc. [Su] = 1.50.16d
5ab	tatas taṃ deśam āgamyā kṛtakarmā vibhiṣaṇaḥ cf. ājagāmātha taṃ deśam sasugrivo vibhiṣaṇaḥ		cf.
18ab	tayoḥ samabhavad yuddhaṃ tadānyonyam jigiṣataḥ vimardas tumulo yuddhe paraspavadvaiṣṇoḥ		
18d	śakraprahlaḍayor iva		
20b	rāvaṇiḥ krodhamūrchitaḥ		
20d	śarāṇ āśviṣopamān		
21d	tan me nigadataḥ śṛṇu		
26	sa putram nīhataṃ dīṣtvā trāsāt saṃbhṛāntalocanaḥ rāvaṇaḥ śokamohārto vadehiṃ hantum udyataḥ sa putravadaḥasamtaptaḥ śūraḥ krodhavaśaṃ gataḥ samīkṣya rāvaṇo buddhyā sītāṃ hantum vyavasyata		
27a	aśokavanikāsthāṃ tām		cf. 6.80.29
27b	rāmadaṛśanalāśaṃ		= 6.37.12c
27c	khaḍgam ādāya duṣṭātmā		= 5.12.41b 6.80.34c

31b	sākṣād api śatkratuḥ	:	sākṣād api puraṇdarah	5.49.32b and 6.80.26d
274.1a	tataḥ kruddho daśagrīvah			= 6.83.40a
2b	vividhāyudhapāṇibhiḥ	:	vividhāyudhahastāś ca	= 6.41.24a
4d	daśagrīvasya paśyataḥ			= 6.31.77d
5d	rāvaṇo rākṣaseśvarah	=	Mbh.3.275.49d	= 6.93.26b etc. [Su]
12b	rathenādityavarasā			= 6.59.15d v.l.
12d	mātaliḥ śakrasārathīḥ			= 6.100.5b [Su]
16b	rāvaṇasya durātmanah			= 6.97.17d etc.
1298*	daśakandhararājasūnvoḥ		tathā yuddham abhūn mahat	
1299*	alabdhopamam anyatra tayoḥ eva tathābhavat			cf.
	gandharvāpsarasām saṅghā dṛṣtvā yuddham anūpamam			
	gaganam gaganākāraṃ sāgaraḥ sāgaropamaḥ			
	rāmarāvaṇayor yuddham rāmarāvaṇayor iva			
	evam bruvanto dadṛṣus tad yuddham rāmarāvaṇam			6.3064* 3-6 [.]
20b	ciccheda nīṣitaiḥ śaraiḥ			= 6.63.32d
21d	śastrāṇi vividhāni ca			= 6.92.29b [Su]
26d	devagandharvakimṇarāḥ	:	devagandharvadānavāḥ	= 6.100.1b etc.
29d	rāmeṇākṣiṣṭakarmanā			= 6.31.62b etc.
275.1d	rāmaḥ saumitrīṇā saha	=	50b and 58b (+263.24b)	= 6.32.20b etc.
2b	devāḥ sarṣipurogamāḥ	:	devāḥ sarṣigaṇās tadā	= 6.3064* 1 post.
3a	rāmaṃ kamalapatrākṣam			= 6.102.1c v.l.
9a	tām dṛṣtvā cārusarvāṅgim			= 6.1541* pr.
14d	nikṛtā kadali yathā	:	pravāte kadali yathā	= 2.109.18d etc.
17d	darśayām āsa rāghavam			= 7.82.4d
19a	rājā daśarathaś caiva	:	rājā daśaratho mṛtaḥ	= 6.114.5d
19cd	vimānena mahārheṇa haṃsayuktēna bhāsvatā			cf.
	yayau tena vimānena haṃsayuktēna bhāsvatā			6.110.23ab
25d	vānarāṇaṃ mahātmanām			= 6.16.6d etc. [Su]
31a	avadhyāḥ sarvabhūtānām			= 7.1.21c
32b	hṛtā sitā durātmanā	:	hṛtā bhāryā durātmanā	= 6.29.4d
32cd	nalakūbarasāpēna rakṣā...	:	nalakūbaranirmuktaṃ śāpam...	= 7.551* 2

33	yadi hy akāmām āsevet striyam anyām api dhruvām śatadhāsyā phaled deha ity uktaḥ so 'bhavat purā yadā tv akāmām kāmārto dhārṣayiṣati yoṣitam mūrdhā tu saptadhā tasya śakalibhavitā tadā pitā daśaratho 'smi te rāma raktāntalocana tam uvāca tato brahmā sadevāsuraṅdharvāḥ yakṣarākṣasapannagāḥ kathayiṣyanti lokās tvām yāvad bhūmir dhariṣyati sadevāḥ kathayiṣyanti yāvad bhūmir dhariṣyati rāmaṃ śastrabhṛtām varam puṣpakena vimānena khecarena virājatā	cf. 7.26.44 [Sl] 6.107.7b 3.19.12b (acc.) etc. = 1.62.21a 4.31.19c, 7.61.21a 6.48.7b cf. 6.88.53cd [Su] 2.92.10d, 3.3.14d 6.114.44c = vv.ll. for 6.110.23ab [Sl] 6.113.1a 6.115.12d = 6.113.27a 5.33.41c = 6.116.55a [Su] = 6.116.82c [Su]
35b		
37d		
40a		
48a		
48b		
48cd		
49b		
52a		
52b		
59a	ayodhyām sa samāsādhyā nandigrāmam upāgamat sa tatra maladigdhāṅgaṃ rāghavaḥ sahasaamitriḥ vasiṣṭho vāmadevaś ca daśāśvamedhān ājahre	: ayodhyām tu samālokya : jaṭilaṃ maladigdhāṅgam : śatāśvamedhān ājahre

PARALLELS BETWEEN THE RĀMĀYAṆA AND THE RĀMOPĀKHYANA
(RĀMĀYAṆA ORDER)

I. In sequence

<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>	<i>Mbh.3 (RU)</i>	<i>Comments</i>
1.1.42d	: 258.2d	part of <i>RU</i> summary (<i>RU</i> = <i>Rām.</i> 4.6.3d)
14.7ab	cf. 260.2cd	
16.2c	: 7a	
3b	= 13d	
13d v.l.	= 7d	<i>Rām.</i> v.l. of NE mss. 504* is S insert; <i>Mbh.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> (also <i>Rām.</i> 6.57.13b)
504* 1 post.	= 13b	
17.10ab	cf. 258.7ab	1st <i>pāda</i> several times in <i>Mbh.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> in <i>Bāla</i> , <i>Uttara</i> and <i>Mbh.</i> also at <i>Rām.</i> 1.39.4a etc. <i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> <i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
14ab	: 259.13ab	
45.6a etc.	= 20a	
64.13a	= 260.10a	
69.30f etc.	= 261.2b etc.	
72.17b	= 13b	20* mostly lacking in NW (i.e. NE+S)
2.1.32b	= 10d	
20* 6 pr.	: 11a	
3.11cd	: 9bc	
4.3b etc.	= 29b	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> 504* is S insert; <i>Mbh.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> (also <i>Rām.</i> 6.57.13b)
133* 1	cf. 17cd	
8.3ab	= 18ab	135* insert of some N mss. (NE, NW and W) v.l. of some S mss.; also = <i>Rām.</i> 5.31.17d cf. <i>vanar</i> <i>gacchatu rāmaś ca 2.208* 1 pr.</i> (N ins.)
135*	= cd	
22b v.l.	= 25d	
9.39b	= 19b	stock long compound also general similarity of 10.10cd and 261.23ab
10.10ab	= 22cd	
195* 1	: 1245* 1	both N inserts (<i>RU</i> 2nd <i>pāda</i> = <i>Rām.</i> 5.33.11b)
28b	= 40b	260* insert of some NE mss., one W, also M4
260* 2	= 25ab	
64.22d	= 35d	1715* is N subst. (also M4) for 2.66.44 1744* is N subst. (also M4) for 2.68.5-6 cf. also <i>Rām.</i> 2.61.5a and 82.19c
1715* 5 pr.	: 31c	
1744* 3	cf. 33ab	
73.2a	= 31a	
77.6ab+c	: 35ab+36d	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
92.8b etc.	= 28d	
107.12cd	cf. 38cd	
3.4.16d	= 39d	<i>RU</i> = <i>Rām.</i> 3.60.2c <i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pādas</i> ; cf. also <i>Rām.</i> 5.35.16ab
15.2d	: 40c	
25.22ab	: 42cd	645* is S insert = <i>Rām.</i> 3.749* 1 pr. (S insert) cf. also 761* (N subst. for 1ab)
29.1b	= 42b	
30.2a	= 43a	
645* 4 pr.	: 262.3b	
38.17a	= 12c	
40.1	cf. 14	

<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>	<i>Mbh.3 (RU)</i>	<i>Comments</i>
12cd	cf. 16cd	
42.18ab	: 22cd	<i>Rām.</i> text = S; N subst. 818* not so close
43.34b v.l.	: 27d	v.l. of most N mss.
847*	cf. 30ab	847* is N subst. for 3.44.2ab
44.9a	= c	= <i>Rām.</i> 4.17.24c
45.22c+25ab	: 33bcd	cf. also <i>Rām.</i> 3.46.2c+10ab
27d v.l.	= 34c	v.l. of all N mss.
40cd[l.v.]	cf. 38	
47.8c	: 32b	
50.12ab	: 41c	+ <i>Rāmāyaṇa</i> order reversed to simplify
48.3d	= 263.1c	+ <i>Rāmopākhyāna</i> order
984* 1-2	: 4bc	984* is NE subst. for 3.49.33 (cf. 956* 1 pr.)
52.1cd	: 8ab	
11c	= 1260* 4 pr.	<i>RU</i> insert of some N mss. (and G3)
55.14cd	: 11ab	
56.9a	: 13c	
58.7b	: 22b	
63.9a+c	cf. 15cd	
1266* 3,8	cf. 27c,29cd	1266* is S insert after 3.65.23
67.19a	= 39a	
68.12cd	: 41ab	
1298*	cf. 42b+d	1298* is S insert after 3.68.21
71.25a	: 39c	<i>Rām.</i> text = S; cf. 1289* 4 (NE) and 1290* (NW)
4.1.43a+d v.l.	: 40ab	vv.ll. of NE mss.
2.1b etc.	: 264.8d	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> (1.69.30f etc.)
12.18c	: 31a	
37ab	: 34ab	
16.1ab/20.1d	: 18b/20b	
331* 2 post.	= 27d	331* is NE insert after 4.16.14
22.2b	: 13b	
25.14d	= 1b	
32cd	: 23ab	cf. also <i>Rām.</i> 4.49.6ab
29.5d	= 2d	+ <i>Rāmāyaṇa</i> order reversed
27.1c	= 266.1c	+
29.6a,2ab	: 1d,2ab	The subject matter of <i>Rām.</i> 4.29-36
48d	cf. 10c	is postponed in the <i>Rāmopākhyāna</i>
34.3ab	: 16ab	
35.3d	: 15b	
36.37b etc.	= 13d	
38.18ab	: 267.4cd	The description of the mustering of
cd	: 2ab	the search parties (<i>Rām.</i> 4.38) used
20b	: 6a	in <i>RU</i> for departure for Lankā
724* 3	: 8cd	724* is N subst. for 38.27cd
32c	= 9a	
39.38b	: 21d	+ <i>Rāmāyaṇa</i> order reversed
9b etc.	= 264.21b	+

<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>	<i>Mbh.3 (RU)</i>	<i>Comments</i>
47.19ab	: 37ab	<i>RU</i> continues the basic story in
55.2a	: 266.48a	<i>adhyāya</i> 264
1166*	: 52ab	N insert after 55.17/20
57.7ab	: 49cd	Sampāti's intervention delayed in
58.7b	= 38b	<i>RU</i> until Hanumān's narration
5.12.11c etc.	: 264.41c	
415* 3 post.	= 42b	NE insert after 5.13.37
19.3ab	: 265.17cd	cf. 3.54.1cd
6a	: 21a	Sitā's harassment postponed slightly in <i>RU</i>
472*/520*	: 4d-5d	N and S versions
22.16ab	: 8ab	+
23.9cd	: 25cd	+
22.7c	cf. 264.49a	+
25.4c	: 53b	
6ab	cf. 61ab	
19ab	: 64c+65d	
614* 1-2	}	S insert
617* 1		N insert
25a	= 65a	
32.1a etc.	= 52a	stock <i>pāda</i>
35.12ab	: 55ab	
47b	: 266.44c	
38.4c	= 67c	also = <i>Rām.</i> 5.1361* 2 pr. (NE+NW insert)
21b	= 61b	stock <i>pāda</i> (= <i>Rām.</i> 1.69.30f etc.)
59.11b	: 26b	
60.3acd	: 28bcd	
63.8b	: 57e	<i>RU</i> = <i>Rām.</i> 5.28.33c
10ab	= 58ab	
6.3.6b etc.	= 267.16b	
4.25c	: 12a	
71d	: 22d	
75a	: c	
11.5b v.l.	= 46d	N v.l.; cf. 10.12d and text of 11.5b
13.9b	= 49b	
238* pr.	: 37c	238* is S insert at 6.14.12, also similar
258* 8-9	cf. 267.40	258* is N insert after 6.15.5/6
15.8	cf. 41	
9c	: 42c	
280* 1	cf. 35ab	280* is N insert after 6.15.13
20ab v.l.	= 44cd	vv.ll. of most N mss. (and some S in a)
306* 6 pr.	= 45a	306* is N insert/subst. at 6.15.22/26
31d	: 20b	
16.9b,22b	= 52b	
330* 5	cf. 53ab	330* is NE and S insert after 6.16.17
17.5b etc.	= 268.17d	
31.50c	= 21c	
56ab	= 16cd	

<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>	<i>Mbh.3 (RU)</i>	<i>Comments</i>	
66a	: 10b		
67a	: a		
68a	= 15a		
71ab	cf. 17ab		
73cd	: 18bc		
32.29d	: 36c	+	<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i> order modified to clarify <i>RU</i>
33.4d etc.	= 32b	+	order
34.1b,2d	: 37b	+	
32.27d	= 269.10d	+	
28b	: 11b	+	
32a	: 10a	+	
33.5b	= 270.9d	+	also = 271.26d
16ab	: ab	+	
42.17b	: 15b		
29b	= 14d		= 271.24b
d	= 13d		
34b v.l.	= 2b		v.l. of some S mss. (but text is close to <i>RU</i>)
36a	: 15a		
b	= 17b		
44.30a	: 5a		<i>RU</i> = <i>Rām.</i> 7.27.42a
48.11cd	: 20cd		
12d etc.	= 21f		
50.12cd	cf. 22cd	+	<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i> order modified
1099* 3	: 24ab	+	1099* is insert of all N mss. and G1
48.34b	= 271.5b	+	
52.25b	= 12d		stock <i>pāda</i>
54.26b	= 10b		
55.63b etc.	= 24b		= 270.14d
74d	= 4b		
59.66d etc.	= 11d	+	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
56.2ab	: 272.1ab	+	<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i> order reversed with previous
		+	item
67.37b	= 9d		
68.4b etc.	= 26b		<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> (= 1.69.30f etc.)
75.1b	= 273.20b		also = 6.1719* 4 post. (NE insert)
3d v.l.	= d		v.l. of all N mss. + M1.2; a stock simile
28cd	: 18ab		cf. 6.76.29 and 78.21ab
31a	cf. d		cf. 6.78.27
80.26d	: 31b		<i>Mbh.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
29	: 26		
34c	: 27c		
51b etc.	= 274.5d		<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
83.40a	= 1a		
87.47b etc.	= 29d		<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
92.29b	= 21d		
96.14b etc.	= 6b		stock <i>pāda</i> (= <i>RU</i> 272.23d, <i>Rām.</i> 6.4.11d etc.)

<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>	<i>Mbh.3 (RU)</i>	<i>Comments</i>
3064* 3-6	: 1298* {	3064* is insert of many mss. (N+S) at 96.19
	1299* }	1298*+1299* are inserts of some mss. (N+S)
97.17d	= 16b	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
100.1b	: 26d	stock long compounds
5b	= 12d	<i>Mbh.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> ; cf. also <i>Rām.</i> 6.90.8cd
3064* 1 post.	: 275.2b	+ <i>Rām.</i> item postponed to simplify <i>RU</i> order
102.1c v.l.	= 3a	v.l. of D9-11 (S mss.)
107.7b	: 35b	
108.17b	= 1d,50b,58b	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> (= 3.7.11b etc.)
110.23ab	: 19cd	
113.1a	: 59a	
27a	: 61a	
114.5d	: 19a	cf. also 6.3249* 1 pr. (N insert)
44c	= 52a,56c	
115.12d	= 60d	
116.55a etc.	= 65c	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
82c	: 69c	<i>RU</i> = <i>Mbh.</i> 2 App. 21.547 pr. and 7.9.61a; various N mss. of <i>Rām.</i> make 82d similar to 69d

II. Random

<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>	<i>Mbh.3 (RU)</i>	<i>Comments</i>
1.1.23d etc.	= 1263* post.	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> (1263* is S insert in <i>RU</i>)
36b	= 261.41d	
7.2	: 1243*	1243* is insert of D1 only
11.3c,11c	: 15c	
13.13d	= 265.4b	<i>Mbh.</i> stock long compound
532* 5 post.	: 261.6b	532* is insert of NE mss. (+ 2 NW and 1 S)
21.8a	= 267.17a	cf. also <i>Rām.</i> 2.20.30a and <i>RU</i> 262.19b
50.16d	= 273.21d	<i>Mbh.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
62.21a	= 275.40a	
64.21b	= 266.30d	
71.7c	: 259.6c	<i>RU</i> account of Rāvaṇa (genealogy and past exploits)
72.21b	= 13b	<i>RU</i> account of Rāvaṇa
2.28.5d	= 262.2d	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
993* 1 post.	= 269.9d	<i>Mbh.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> ; 993* is S insert
66.26d etc.	= 258.5d etc.	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i> (<i>adhy.</i> 258 is <i>RU</i> summary)
84.21b	= 266.67d	= <i>Rām.</i> 1 App. I.1.69 post.
92.10d etc.	= 275.49b	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
95.34d	= 267.10b	<i>Mbh.</i> stock simile
109.18d	: 275.14d	stock simile
3.12.9c	= 262.2c	stock <i>pāda</i>
19.12b etc.	= 275.37d	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
24.27d etc.	= 260.12b etc.	stock <i>pāda</i>
28ab	: 271.21ab	<i>RU</i> 1st <i>pāda</i> = <i>Rām.</i> 4.12.17a
25.14d	: 25cd	
27.12d	: 272.10d	<i>Mbh.</i> stock simile
32.2b v.l.	= 258.4b	v.l. of N mss. at 32.2b; <i>adhy.</i> 258 is <i>RU</i> summary
47.27b	= 264.63b	
48.25d etc.	= 258.9d	<i>RU</i> summary
53.14ab } 1056* 4 }	: 265.11	1056* is NE subst.
64.9abc	: 258.2abc	<i>RU</i> summary
70.6d etc.	= 271.21d	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
4.7.15b	: 267.1d	
13.4d	= 9b	
14.15b	= 263.41d	
26.14d	= 262.30d	also = <i>Mbh.</i> 4.64.6d
36.14a	= 263.25c	
38.13ab	: 268.27cd	
50.17b	= 259.4d	<i>Mbh.</i> stock long compound; <i>RU</i> account of Rāvaṇa
59.1d	= 271.2b	<i>Mbh.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
5.8.26a	: 268.34a	cf. RAGHAVAN, <i>The Greater Rāmāyaṇa</i> , p. 20
12.41b	= 273.27b	long compound also at <i>Rām.</i> 5.55.27d

<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>	<i>Mbh.3 (RU)</i>	<i>Comments</i>
16.3d	= 260.2b	
19.10	= 268.11	
24.4d etc.	: 266.35d	stock <i>pāda</i>
33.41c	= 275.62c	variant of stock <i>pāda</i>
6.9.6b	= 272.2d	
16.6d etc.	= 275.25d	<i>Rām.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
17.12a	= 266.61c	
19.22d	= 261.9d	= 6.106.2d and <i>RU</i> 264.49d (stock long compound)
28.1c	= 264.23c	
29.4d	: 275.32b	
31.77d	= 274.4d	
35.9d	= 264.32d	<i>Mbh.</i> stock simile, also at <i>Rām.</i> 6.1717* 2 post.
16a	: 273.2ab	The <i>RU</i> transposes a complete section
36.2cd	: 5ab	cf. 6.39.31d (v.l. of N mss.)
3abc	: 4abc	
37.12c	= 27a	
41.24a	: 274.2b	
46.18b	= 272.24d	
48.7b	= 275.48b	<i>Mbh.</i> stock long compound, also at <i>Rām.</i> 7.17.9b
55.70d	= 263.4f	<i>Rām.</i> stock simile
57.35c	: 267.11c	
59.15d v.l.	= 274.12b, 275.49d	v.l. of N mss. and some S mss.
63.32d	= 20b	stock <i>pāda</i>
1541* pr.	= 275.9a	1541* is insert of NE and S mss.
72.31b	= 271.10d	stock <i>pāda</i>
75.22c	: 270.4c	partially stereotyped (long compound in <i>Mbh.</i>)
83.37c	: 269.5b	
88.53b	: 14d v.l.	<i>RU</i> v.l. of S mss.
cd	: 275.48cd	
101.9d	: 258.3c	<i>RU</i> summary
7.1.21c	= 275.31a	
2.4bcd	: 258.11b+12ab	<i>RU</i> summary
3.7c	: 12c	<i>RU</i> summary
5.26a	: 268.2d	
10.6ab	: 259.36ab	<i>RU</i> account of Rāvaṇa (genealogy and past exploits)
10bcd	: 20abc	<i>RU</i> account of Rāvaṇa; cf. also <i>Rām.</i> 1.45.6a
13a	: 258.15a	<i>RU</i> summary
21	: 259.23	<i>RU</i> account of Rāvaṇa
167*	= 30	<i>RU</i> account of Rāvaṇa; (167* insert of several mss., N and S, not NW)
29b	= 29b	<i>RU</i> account of Rāvaṇa

<i>Rāmāyaṇa</i>	<i>Mbh.3 (RU)</i>	<i>Comments</i>
30 v.l.	= 31	<i>RU</i> account of Rāvaṇa; v.l. of several mss., N+S
11.12d, 47.9d	= 264.54d, etc.	<i>Mbh.</i> stock <i>pāda</i>
20c	= 267.54c	
15.29cd	: 259.34ab	<i>RU</i> account of Rāvaṇa; cf. <i>Rām.</i> 3.30.14cd
26.44	: 275.33	cf. also <i>Rām.</i> 7.548* (N mss. + T3.4)
551* 2	: 32cd	551* is S insert
61.21a	= 48a	also = <i>Rām.</i> 4.31.19c (stock long compound)
82.4d	= 17d	
83.7b	= 267.15d	also = <i>Rām.</i> 1.110* 4 post.
94.18d	= 266.55d	

Explanation of signs

All references to the *Rāmāyaṇa* and to the *Mahābhārata* are given according to the standard system of their Critical Editions; any figure carried forward from the previous line has usually been left blank.

- = In the first table (*Rāmopākhyāna* order), this sign indicates complete identity (or with minor variations as specified); in the second table (*Rāmāyaṇa* order), it indicates identity or virtual identity (e.g. difference of case only in a stereotyped expression).
- : In the first table, this sign is used between single *pādas* to indicate lesser agreement of all kinds; in the second table, it indicates substantial identity but without full agreement of wording.
- cf. In the first table, this sign is used between longer items with the same meaning as the preceding sign; in the second table, it indicates more general similarity, sufficient to establish borrowing of at least the idea expressed.
- + Placed against those points in the second table where the strict order of the *Rāmāyaṇa* references is modified.
- [J.] [Sl] [Su] [R.] These signs indicate that the parallel against which they are set was first noted by H. Jacobi, E. Śluszkiewicz, V. S. Sukthankar or V. Raghavan respectively (used in the first table only).
- v.l. Denotes a variant reading recorded in the Critical Apparatus.